
Economy & Efficiency Commission Meeting Minutes

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY COMMISSION

THURSDAY, July 12, 2001
ROOM 830, KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION

Editorial Note: Agenda sections may be taken out of order at the discretion of the chair. Any reordering of sections is reflected in the presentation of these minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER OF COMMISSION MEETING

With the presence of a quorum of commissioners, Chairman Philibosian called the Commission meeting to order at 10:15 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF COMMISSIONER'S ABSENCES

Chairman Philibosian asked for a motion to approve absences.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Clayton Anderson
Fred Balderrama
Joanne Baltierrez
Isaac Diaz Barcelona
Annie E. Cho
Jonathan Fuhrman
Jaclyn Tilley Hill
Royal F. Oakes
Roman Padilla
Robert H. Philibosian
Julia Sylva
H. Randall Stoke
G. Thomas Thompson
Tony Tortorice

COMMISSIONERS REQUESTING TO BE EXCUSED

Hope J. Boonshaft
John Crowley
David W. Farrar
Chun Lee

Tony Lucente
William J. Petak

COMMISSIONERS NOT REQUESTING AN EXCUSE

None

It was Moved, Seconded, and Adopted: The Commission members requesting an excuse, be excused.

III. APPROVAL OF June 7, 2001 MINUTES

Chairman Philibosian asked if there were any corrections or amendments to the minutes or presentation. Hearing none the following motion was Moved, Seconded, and Adopted: The minutes and presentation of the June 7, 2001 Commission meeting be approved.

IV. APPROVAL OF June 7, 2001 PRESENTATION

Chairman Philibosian stated that the District Attorney commended both Mr. Staniforth and Ms. Gill for their summary of his presentation to the commission on June 7, 2001 and asked if there were any corrections or amendments to the presentation. Hearing none the following motion was Moved, Seconded, and Adopted: The presentation of the June 7, 2001 Commission meeting be approved.

V. INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Staniforth asked the two press representatives to introduce themselves. Ms. Victoria Santee stated that she was reporting for the Metro Section; and Ms. Katherine Edds stated that she was reporting for the Metropolitan News.

VI. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Staniforth stated he had received a report from the Auditor Controller concerning the Sunset Review. The Auditor Controller is recommending that the E & E Commission's Sunset date be extended to July 1, 2006. It will be on the Board of Supervisor's Agenda when the Audit Committee meets and makes a recommendation to the Board.

The E & E Commission office has completed the conversion of all the commission reports to HTML. They need to be entered on the website. This will result in a display of 100% of the commission's reports.

The next E & E Commission meeting has been scheduled for August 2nd. Chairman Philibosian asked how many commissioners would not be able to attend the commission meeting and noted that there would be a quorum. The meeting for August 2, 2001 will be held.

Chairman Philibosian mentioned that no one had been scheduled for the presentation in August 2001. Commissioner Sylva stated that she would like to ask Carlos Jackson, Executive Director of Los Angeles County Economic Development Commission to address the E & E Commission. Commissioner Thompson stated that he would like August to be a "clean-up" meeting: with reference to the Grand Jury Report; the ILP Study; and the Joint Policy and Organization and Accountability Task Forces' Study concerning economic development in Los Angeles County. Commissioner Stoke agreed and left it up to Judge Thompson to invite the ILP consultants whom he would like to come to the Commission meeting. Commissioner Baltierrez asked if Carlos Jackson could be put on a future list.

Chairman Philibosian agreed with the possibility of Carlos Jackson as a future presenter if that were the wish of the Commission.

Chairman Philibosian confirmed with the commissioners present that the next commission meeting needed to be one devoted to a working session.

Mr. Staniforth stated that two district deputies/board members per meeting would be invited to the September/October meetings. Commissioner Sylva asked again if Carlos Jackson could be scheduled. Chairman Philibosian stated that Carlos Jackson could be scheduled for the November 1st meeting. Commissioner Cho reminded the Commission that the idea of mayors from cities as presenters was discussed in the last meeting. Chairman Philibosian noted that there were 88 cities in the County of Los Angeles. Commissioner Hill suggested that the city manager of Long Beach come before the Commission. Commissioner Thompson suggested a plan where a representative from a large city, a medium city and a small city could be represented from the urban area, the suburban area, and the southern area of the county. Chairman Philibosian reminded the commission that originally contract cities were discussed because they are the nexus of the county. Commissioner Sylva agreed and suggested that the contract cities could be dealt with first and then the independent cities. Commissioner Fuhrman stated that he was interested in the contract cities' issues, to see

how the county's service delivery, particularly from the Sheriff and from the County, is being perceived. Chairman Philibosian summarized that the Commission needs a cross section of the contract cities based on geography and different population mixes, perhaps three or four cities represented in a panel during one Commission meeting including someone from the Contract Cities Association.

Chairman Philibosian noted that Mr. Janssen had just entered the E & E Commission Meeting and asked if there were a coordinator between Los Angeles County and the Contract Cities. Mr. Janssen responded that it is department by department: the Sheriff, Public Works, Libraries, and the District Attorney.

X. PRESENTATION (a)

[Mr. David Janssen](#)

[Los Angeles County Chief Administrative Officer](#)

[Topic: The State of the Los Angeles County Budget](#)

Chairman Philibosian introduced David E. Janssen, the Chief Administrative Officer for the County of Los Angeles, who discussed various aspects of the Los Angeles County Budget: in particular the Healthcare System's potential deficit and the Independent Living Program, Emancipation Services study.

VI. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT (CONTINUED)

Chairman Philibosian continued with the issue of contract cities suggesting that Commissioner Sylva and Mr. Staniforth meet to recommend how a contract cities' panel could be set up.

VII. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Chairman Philibosian stated that there was nothing to report.

VIII. LIAISON REPORTS

Local Government Services Commission

Commissioner Andes, the Local Government Services (LGS) Commission Liaison, was absent.

Quality and Productivity Commission

Commissioner Anderson replied that he was recently appointed as the Liaison for the Quality and Productivity Commission. The Commuter Connection publication was passed out to commissioners in the meeting, which goes to all county employees. He said that Commissioner Hill mobilized an energy think tank consisting of the Chairperson, Southern California Edison, Xerox Corporation and ISD to create promotional programs to raise energy conservation awareness of county employees. Included are a pledge card located on the back of publication will stimulate employee interest in energy conservation, as well as a pin asking "How's Your Energy?" The Q & P Commission in conjunction with the Beaches and Harbors Commission are sponsoring a summer night's music program at Chase Park that is free to the public.

IX. OLD BUSINESS - TASK FORCE REPORTS

Finance Task Force

Commissioner Thompson remarked that the Emancipation Services Study is 60 days from its completion date, and the Department of Children and Family Services has pulled two advisors (appointed by them) from the project in order to assign new advisors. Mr. Staniforth has written memos to DCFS trying to explain that the E & E Commission is conducting an evaluation study. Supervisor Antonovich has made a motion that the Independent Living Program to be transferred to the Chief Administrative Office. Commissioner Thompson said that the E & E Commission should ask the Board to make a substitute/amended motion which would allow the study to remain, allow the Commission to keep the consultants who have been working on the study, and not do anything with the program until the Emancipation Services Report is finalized. Chairman Philibosian responded that he doubted whether the Board would want to get to that level of detail in the board motion, however the Commission might want to ask Supervisor Antonovich to table the motion to allow for more discussion with DCFS. Commissioner Baltierrez stated that an amendment that Commissioner Padilla put in writing would be more appropriate. Commissioner Padilla said that his amendment does not challenge the motion, but asks the Board of Supervisors to direct the departments to cooperate and to devote the necessary resources and staff to support the E & E Commission's Emancipation Services Study. Commissioner Padilla felt that this would raise the profile of the report. Commissioner Thompson thought that the Chairman's suggestion was better which was to continue the motion for a week in order to allow for discussion. Chairman Philibosian stated that it could be accomplished without making a board motion, which would then lead to discussion, and the Supervisors

would see it as criticism of the department director. Commissioner Fuhrman asked which supervisor had primary responsibility? Chairman Philibosian stated that a chart was sent out indicating the department assignments for each supervisor.

Commissioner Thompson remarked that he needed a sense of the Commission – in sensitive situations, is there a problem with individual commissioners speaking directly to consultants without speaking to the Chair. Chairman Philibosian replied that the reason for the task force structure and task force chairs was that the executive director could work through the task force chair to coordinate activities. All of the commissioners have equal access to the executive director, however the consultants are people on contract and they devote an “x” amount of time to the commission’s particular issues. If consultants devote their time to one particular commissioner’s request, that time will be detracted from the time that they have available to spend on the task force. Generally, consultant contacts are through the task force chairs. Commissioner Baltierrez agreed, however she felt that commissioners should be able to talk with consultants regarding simple matters. Commissioner Hill stated that her experience with the E & E Commission since 1994 has been that the “modus operandi” for the commissioners is not one of independence, but that the task force chair is the communicator. Any commissioner who is contacting a consultant on their own is improper and would indicate that the commissioner were influencing consultants or gathering information that is not gathered by the group. The task force works as a consensus driven body and the success of the Commission has been based on that. Commissioner Fuhrman stated that the problem arose because he called one of the consultants and invited him out to lunch. Although this was viewed as inappropriate, he disagrees. Commissioner Thompson stated that it was inappropriate for the reason that the E & E Commission hired the consultants. Chairman Philibosian stated that Commissioner Thompson as task force chair could resolve that problem with the commissioners on the task force.

Commissioner Tortorice stated that the appropriate procedure is a standard Robert’s Rules of Order, which is through the chair; however, if as a commissioner he wanted to have direct contact he should ask the chair. Commissioner Padilla commented that he understands both points of view and has worked on projects where the protocol was different in each case. In some projects the commissioners had a great deal of communication with the consultants and in others, none; but a good product resulted regardless. Communication between the commissioners, the chair, and the executive director is key. Chairman Philibosian stated that there are two issues: one is financial and the other is the consultant’s confusion that will be getting different signals from different commissioners, therefore centralization is key. The consultants should be getting one signal from the task force through the chair. If there is a problem with the chair then the problem is brought to the Commission. Chairman Philibosian suggested that individuals of the commission not contact consultants. Commissioner Thompson stated that the issue is very emotional, where young people who may never get another chance are involved. There are supervisors who intensely dislike various parts of different agencies. The Commission must maintain its objectivity. Chairman Philibosian made a motion to take this issue up at a later date. Hearing no objections the following motion was Moved, Seconded, and Adopted: Continuation of the discussion of commissioner contact with consultants be continued to a later dated.

Grand Jury

Commissioner Hill thanked Chairman Philibosian for the task force assignment of last September 2000. She remarked that the bifurcated system was enacted in response to a request by the Superior Court to deliver a diversified body of grand jurors representing the constituency of the County of Los Angeles. The review is being issued at a unique time in Los Angeles County where there is a strong collaboration between the Superior Court, the Chief Administrative Office and the Board of Supervisors. The Task Force collected the data; the argument is in the body of the report, and has been with the Commission for two months. Comments, concerns and questions have been sought from the commissioners, and those who contributed are thanked for their participation. For purposes of discussion Commissioner Hill moved that the Review of the Los Angeles County Grand Jury proceed for approval. Hearing none the following motion was Moved, and Seconded: The Review of the Effectiveness of the Los Angeles County Grand Jury be approved.

Chairman Philibosian opened the floor for discussion and stated that he received a letter from the District Attorney in which he commends the commission on the report generally as follows: “The dual system currently constituted and operated is not adequate to handle lengthy criminal probes which the single Grand Jury handled in the past. As is accurately indicated in the commission’s report, investigations related to the Belmont Learning Center, Rampart Scandal and probes initiated by the newly organized Organized Crime and Public Integrity Division are likely to require a potentially long-term use of the Grand Jury. However it is important to note that the Superior Court did agree to lengthen the term of the Criminal Grand Jury on an as needed basis, and recently allowed for the selection of a two month Criminal Grand Jury for an upcoming criminal investigation.”

District Attorney Steve Cooley has two suggestions under the Section entitled Term of Service of the Grand Jury:

“First, the statement that criminal grand jurors are selected from a countywide Petit Grand Jury pool is a misnomer. Criminal Grand Juries are selected from a countywide Master Jury pool.” Commissioner Hill said that that had been

corrected. A paragraph below that was another term “criminal complaint” which has been corrected to “citizen’s complaint”.

The second suggestion from the District Attorney said that he has created the Organized Crime Division and he is anticipating additional funding to support staffing, that is not part of our report. He does have an additional suggestion that does not have to be included in the report: perhaps some remedial legislation is something the Economy and Efficiency Commission can recommend now that the commission has completed its helpful and insightful evaluation. Chairman Philibosian would like to continue the task force, and have the task force look at remedial legislation and consult with some of the same sources whom we consulted with to date, including the District Attorney. The E & E Commission could consider them doing a follow up report, which we will present to the Board of Supervisors to go to their legislative advocates.

Commissioner Hill stated that she would like to expand that request - Commissioner Barcelona will address the expansion outreach. A proposal will be brought back once a meeting with the task force takes place. Commissioner Padilla commended Commissioner Hill for her report and asked whether the recommendations are still applicable to reunify the Grand Jury? Commissioner Hill responded that the Report does not criticize. It is objective with a balanced view supporting the positive aspects, and has recommendations for areas that need expansion and enhancement. It is more economic and efficient to return to the single system.

Commissioner Fuhrman still had a fundamental problem with the diversity issue from two areas: first, the civil grand jury pool is drawn from a sophisticated computer random process to select the jurors from a pool of people identified by their own volunteering or by recommendation from the judge. Last year’s number in the pool was 96 people, which is not representative. Secondly, service for a one-year period in a grand jury for \$25.00 a day, excludes 99% of the Los Angeles County residents who cannot afford to make that civil commitment for an entire year. Therefore, he cannot support a recommendation to go to a single grand jury until these issues are resolved. Nor has there been a clear statement from the District Attorney that this is a huge impediment to his investigative abilities. Chairman Philibosian referred to the District Attorney Cooley’s letter again, and commented that from his own experience, having presented cases to the Grand Jury as a prosecutor have presented cases to the Grand Jury, two months is not adequate.

Commissioner Thompson called for the question to vote whether or not to approve the Review of the Grand Jury Report. Chairman Philibosian asked all in favor say aye; and all opposed, nay. There was one nay. Chairman Philibosian congratulated the Grand Jury Task Force. Mr. Staniforth stated that he would like to have the authority to make minor typographical changes. Chairman Philibosian asked all in favor or opposed. Hearing no opposition the following motion was Moved, Seconded, and Adopted: that Mr. Staniforth have the authority to make minor typographical changes be approved.

Commissioner Padilla stated that he wanted to be sure that a system would be set up to look at the diversity issue assuring that there is some protocol for a feedback mechanism from year to year. Commissioner Thompson reiterated that a system where each elected official in the County of Los Angeles nominate five people who are placed in a pool, which is representative of the diversity, eliminates a constant feedback necessity. Commissioner Hill reminded the Commission that she spent a year on the Grand Jury and recommended that the other commissioners do likewise. The media outreach that is forthcoming will be extensive. The judges will be responsible for nominating two prospective grand jurors from the district in which they serve, which will give a pool of 1000 people. Responsibility needs to be given to the media to encourage the public to serve on the Grand Jury. Commissioner Fuhrman asked whether the 2001 – 2002 Grand Jury had been seated as of yet. Commissioner Hill responded in the affirmative, as of July 1, 2001. Commissioner Fuhrman asked how large the selection pool was. Commissioner Hill stated that she could get him that information. She continued by commending Mr. Staniforth for his work on the report and the G J Task Force for their tireless interviews. Commissioner Stoke complemented the Grand Jury Task Force for their efforts.

Organization & Accountability

Commissioner Oakes stated that the O & A Task Force has been working jointly with the Policy Task Force, and deferred the Economic Development issue to Commissioner Sylva. Commissioner Oakes briefly reported the status of the election reform proposal in the Legislature, which was up in the air.

Policy

Commissioner Sylva stated that there were many overwhelming issues on the table. She would like the members of the Joint Task Force to review the proposal that has been drafted by Mr. Staniforth before the next commission meeting; so that a recommendation could be submitted before the entire Board of Supervisors in order to proceed with the Economic Development Agenda. Chairman Philibosian asked if the report had been distributed to the Policy Task Force and Organization & Accountability Task Force members. Commissioner Sylva replied that the report would be.

XI. NEW BUSINESS

None

XII. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion from the floor, Chairman Philibosian adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted.



Bruce J. Staniforth
Executive Director

[Go to July 12, 2001 Agenda](#)

[Return to September 6, 2001 Agenda](#)



Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Room 163, 500 West Temple St.,
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone (213) 974-1491 FAX (213) 620-1437 [EMail eecomm@co.la.ca.us](mailto:EEComm@co.la.ca.us)
WEB eec.co.la.ca.us